

Amendments to Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figures 2, 3 and 6. These sheets, which include Figures 2, 3 and 6, replace the original sheets including Figures 2, 3 and 6. In Figure 2, the designating numeral and lead line have been added. In Figure 3, the numerals 16, 24b and 24e and their associated lead lines have been added. In Figure 6, the numerals 24e and 24b and their lead lines have been added.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The present application contains claims 1-14, 17, 18, 22-26 and 29-31. Claims 15, 16, 19-21, 27 and 28 have been cancelled without prejudice to Applicant in order to expedite the prosecution of the present application. Claims 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 23, 29 and 30 have been amended.

Amendments to the Specification

The specification has been amended to cure certain minor informalities and to conform the specification to the figures.

Objections to the Drawings

Figures 2, 3 and 6 have been amended to incorporate certain designating numerals, responsive to the Examiner's requirements.

It is noted that the drawings filed January 14, 2004, have been objected to. It is submitted that the replacement drawings cure these objections as will be discussed in detail below.

No new matter has been added.

Allowable Subject Matter

It is noted that claims 1-5 have been allowed and that claim 7, 17, 22 and 29 have been objected to and will be allowed if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of their base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 17, 22 and 29 have been so amended. It is submitted that since claim 7 depends from claim 6, it is submitted that claim 7 should now be allowed in view of the amendments to claim 6 which, Applicant submits, now patentably distinguishes over the cited prior art for reasons to be set forth in detail below.

It is noted that the claim for foreign priority has been acknowledged in further that all of the certified copies of the priority document has been received.

It is noted that the Examiner, after careful consideration, has determined that the claims of the present application not recite patentably distinct species and that all claims have been examined.

It is noted that the substitute specification dated January 14, 2004, is in compliance with the U.S. Patent Office's rules have been entered.

The objections to the drawings are duly noted and are hereby respectfully traversed. The Examiner notes that elements 16, 24b, 24d and 24e, while described in the specification with respect to Figures 2, 3 5 and 6 are shown only in Figures 5 and 6 and is required replacement drawings.

Applicant has submitted replacement drawings for the Figures 2, 3 and 6. Regarding Figure 2, it should be noted that elements 24b, 24d and 24e are hidden from view in Figure 2. Figures 3 and 6 have been amended to include these designating elements. It is submitted that no numerals are missing in Figure 5. For these reasons, it is submitted that the objection to the drawings should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 6, 8-16, 18-21, 23-28, 30 and 31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Applicant's Conceded Prior Art (ACPA) in view of Ito et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,602,682) (hereinafter, "Ito et al."). This rejection is respectfully traversed as regards to claims 6, 8-14, 18, 23-26, 30 and 31, claims 15, 16, 19-21, 27 and 28 have been cancelled without prejudice to Applicant in order to expedite the prosecution of the present application.

The Examiner referring to paragraphs [0007], [0008] and [0009] as ACPA, nevertheless admits that the ACPA does not teach or disclose a compensating optical system, included in the second camera body, for correcting the curvature-of-field aberration on the image-forming surface of the second image pickup element caused due to the difference in thickness of the first optical low pass filter and the second optical low pass filter, the Examiner relying upon Ito et al. to disclose a lens-interchangeable camera system in which an interchangeable lens barrel is common to a plurality of camera bodies, the Examiner stating that Ito et al. provides a first camera body (color) and a second body (monochrome) each of the camera bodies having a different kind of light receiving elements and different refractive indexes or thickness of filters provided in front of the respected light receiving elements, the Examiner making reference to column 1, lines 17-20 of Ito et al.

Whereas Ito et al. may be said to disclose a technique in which, in order to enable an interchangeable lens which is optimized from a color camera body to be used for a monochrome camera body, employs an aberration correcting play which is attached at a rear of the interchangeable lens. In contrast, in order to enable an interchangeable lens which has been optimized for use with the first camera body (i.e., a reference camera body) to be used with a second camera body, a compensating optical element for correcting aberration (i.e., a compensating optical system) is disposed in the second camera body. Ito et al. never teaches nor suggest disposing an aberration correcting play in the monochrome camera body.

In addition, the compensating optical element (i.e., the compensating optical system) of the present invention is **fixed** to a second low pass filter contained in the second camera body. Ito et al. never teaches nor suggest this feature. In general, it has been found that disposing an optical element in an optical path causes an increase in reflection surface which results in easy occurrence of flare. However, by

fixing a compensating optical element to a low pass filter, increase in reflection surface is prevented and therefore the problem of flare is avoided.

Claim 6, as amended, recites "a compensating optical system fixed to the second optical low pass filter for correcting the curvature-of-field aberration on the image-forming surface of the second image pickup element. For these reasons, it is submitted that claim 6 patentably distinguishes over Ito et al.

Claims 8 and 9 depend from claim 6 and carries all of its limitations and hence are likewise deemed to patentably distinguish over Ito et al. taken with ACPA.

Claim 10 has been amended in a manner similar to claim 6 and it is submitted that claim 10 patentably distinguishes over Ito et al. for the same reasons set forth above regarding claim 6. Claim 11 depends from claim 10 and carries all of its limitations and hence is deemed to patentably distinguish over Ito et al.

Claim 12, as amended, positively recites "a compensating optical system fixed to the second optical filter for correcting for the difference in thickness of the first optical low pass filter and the second optical low pass filter." These features are neither taught nor remotely suggested by Ito et al. in combination with ACPA and it is submitted that claim 12 patentably distinguishes thereover. Claim 13 depends from claim 12 and carries all of its limitations and hence is deemed to patentably distinguish over Ito et al. taken with ACPA.

Claim 14 has been amended to include limitations substantially the same as those recited in claim 12 and it is submitted that claim 14 patentably distinguishes over Ito et al. taken with ACPA for the same reasons set forth above regarding claim 12.

Claim 17, which has been indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of its base claim and any intervening claims, has been so amended. Claim 18 has been amended to depend from claim 17 and it is submitted that claim 18 is now allowable.

Claim 22, which has been indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of its base claim and any intervening claims, has been so amended. Claim 18 has been amended to depend from amended claim 17 and it is submitted to be in an allowable form.

Claim 22 has been indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claim 22 has been so amended. Claim 23 has been amended to depend from claim 22 and it is submitted that claim 23 is now allowable. Claims 24-26 depend from claim 22 or from a claim which depends from claim 22 and are likewise submitted to be allowable.

Claim 29 has been indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claim 29 has been so amended. Claim 30 has been amended to depend from claim 29 and it is submitted to be allowable.

Claim 31 has been amended to recite "a compensating optical system fixed to the second optical element for correcting optical path length due to a difference in thickness between the first optical element and the second optical element." These limitations are substantially similar to the limitations recited in amended claim 12 and it is submitted that claim 31 patentably distinguishes over Ito et al. taken with ACPA.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 6, 8-16, 18, 23-26, 30 and 31 patentably distinguish over Ito et al. taken with ACPA and that these claims should be allowed.

Applicant: Sumio Kawai
Application No.: 10/600,363

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 6, 8-16, 18, 23-26, 30 and 31 are allowable and reconsideration of allowance of these claims are earnestly solicited.

Applicant: Sumio Kawai
Application No.: 10/600,363

Conclusion

If the Examiner believes that any additional minor formal matters need to be addressed in order to place this application in condition for allowance, or that a telephone interview will help to materially advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone at the Examiner's convenience.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application, including claims 1-14, 17, 18, 22-26 and 29-31, are in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Sumio Kawai

By



Louis Weinstein
Registration No. 20,477

Volpe and Koenig, P.C.
United Plaza, Suite 1600
30 South 17th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-6400
Facsimile: (215) 568-6499

LW/hg